



U.S. Department of Energy  
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy



# *Application Content and Merit Review Process*

## **D2 Breakout Session Report-Out**

**Solar America Initiative  
Technical Exchange Meeting  
April 17, 2006**



## **Will the application content requirements allow your technology to be well represented? Is the application content clearly defined? What is the appropriate level of detail for the technical project plan?**

- Emphasis on technical aspects, rather than market analysis
- For each topic area in market analysis (residential, commercial, utility) there would be price and volume requirements
- No export restrictions;
- Target annual manufacturing capacity in the U.S, to allow companies to target installations globally.
- Quarterly and component level progress reporting



## **Is the requested level of detail for manufacturing cost breakdown a feasible level of detail to provide? Are there any issues associated with the level of detail needed for SAM input requirements?**

- SAM need more categories at the component level, specifically BOS
- Replace “other” with breakout for structural, wiring, switchgear and other hardware.
- Separate market efficiency (distribution margins) from manufacturing cost. DOE offer standard assumptions for market efficiency cost, manufacturing cost determined by manufacturers.
- Put a benchmark or fixed metric to justify longer product life. Limited weighting criteria on lifetime.
- Provide major market trends for the business plan context - SAM could provide this.
- Include the distribution chain in SAM



## **Are the Merit Review Criteria appropriate for allowing reviewers to adequately assess a proposed effort? Are the categories sufficient and appropriate? Are the weighting proportions appropriate?**

- Vertical Integration difficult in a business plan. Hard to do quickly and cover all IP issues
- Provide default “component prices” in SAM
- Do a baseline business plan, perhaps a full business plan as a deliverable (next slide)



## **Would you be capable of and/or willing to submit a full Partnership business plan with all the details cited? Will such a plan add value to R&D planning and management?**

- Not in proposal; “Application” has many parts of a business plans
- Required as a deliverable before the first down-select
- Large business cost share is commitment
- Small business supported by business plan (how they will raise money)
- University supported a tech transfer mechanism



## **Based on what you have heard up to this point, what concerns/recommendations do you have concerning the time necessary to prepare the applications**

- Building a partnership within timeframe
- Attendance list valuable as teaming tool
- IIPS website could categorize the attendance list and show what each participant is looking for (needs for vertical integration) and what each have to offer (offers to integrators).
- Be able to identify the component that is needed but specify a “TBD” partner in the application with placeholder budget amounts.
- Show a pathway to vertical integration; how long, staged progress within 3-year blocks or between 3-year blocks over 9 years; some confusion (poor listeners?) as to whether DOE envisions successful teams will be involved for 9 years.



**Typically, FOA Applications limit the Narrative Description to address the Technical Requirements to no more than 25-30 pages. For this proposed FOA, can an Applicant adequately cover the requested information within these page limitations?**

- Up to 30 pages, up to applicant to divide it up.
- Rethink the business plan component Item #4 in NOPI since items #1-3 of NOPI are really parts of a business plan.
- Full Business Plan is difficult within application preparation time frame
- Need to define high level business plan.
- Item #4 in NOPI application might only have financials including unit price, volume, projection cost, and target market(s).